

**SUMMARIZED MINUTES
SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**



**THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2005
CITY HALL KIVA
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission was called to order by Chairman Gilliland at 6:08 p.m.

2. **CALL TO ORDER**

PRESENT: Chairman Mark Gilliland
Vice-Chairman Brian Davis
Commissioner Michael Bruz
Commissioner William Howard
Commissioner Kelly McCall
Commissioner Matthew Taunton

ABSENT: Commissioner J. David Hill

STAFF PRESENT: Harriett Fortner, Transportation Secretary
Teresa Huish, Principal Transportation Planner
Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning and Transit Director
Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager
Paul Porell, Traffic Engineering Director

3. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES** **(Action)**

- Study Session of the Transportation Commission—November 17, 2005
- Regular Meeting of the Transportation Commission—November 17, 2005

Ms. O'Connor noted a couple of possible corrections to the minutes. Staff will review the audio to ensure that the wording is correct. On page 11, in the paragraph that begins "In response to a further inquiry, Mr. Porell speculated..." Staff have a question regarding the sense of the statement attributed to Mr. Porell: "Reliance on that roadway would certainly be a great deal less than if Alameda Road were not a public street." Staff will review the audio to ensure reflection of the correct sense of that statement.

On page 12, in the fourth full paragraph, staff will review the audio recording to determine how many of the people from the four parcels that the Commission had asked Mr. Berry to research were in support of that item. This agenda item from the November 17 meeting of the Commission is potentially scheduled for the City Council meeting on January 24, 2006.

Commissioner McCall noted that both meeting minutes are missing the footer at the bottom regarding audio and/or video recordings being available for six months.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked whether the Commission should hold off on approving the minutes until staff have reviewed the audio recording.

Ms. O'Connor replied that the Commission has that option. Alternatively, the Commission could approve the minutes, recommending that there be a review of the recording. She suggested waiting until staff have completed the review. The item can still be sent to City Council.

COMMISSIONER HOWARD MADE A MOTION TO TABLE THE APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 17, 2005 MEETING UNTIL THE NEXT COMMISSION MEETING. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER TAUNTON AND CARRIED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF 6 (SIX) TO 0 (ZERO).

4. **Transportation Master Plan Draft Public Engagement Plan/Process (Information/Possible Action)**

Commission will review and provide input to the draft public engagement plan/process for the Transportation Master Plan—Dave Meinhardt, Transportation Planning and Transit Director; Teresa Huish, Principal Planner

Ms. Huish presented an update on the elements contained in the Master Plan and plans for public involvement. Highlights of the PowerPoint presentation included: the Purpose of the Plan, Plan Components, Community Working Group, Interviews/Focus Groups/Workshops, Neighborhood/Community Group Meetings, Information Outreach, and Conclusions.

Staff plans to create a website and to distribute six newsletters to keep the public informed. People can also sign up for e-mail updates. Other informational possibilities include utility bill inserts, on-hold messages, bookmarks, and flyers. The public outreach and engagement process is intended to be comprehensive and inclusive, and continue until the completed plan has been approved by the Commission and City Council. Anyone who wants to speak about this plan should have the opportunity to do so. The goal is to provide consistent access to information so that anyone who wants to learn about this process has that opportunity.

Commissioner Taunton asked whether any outreach could be done to high schools. Ms. Huish said that is an excellent point, and staff intended to do so.

In response to inquiry by Vice-Chairman Davis, Ms. Huish reported that the workshops will likely need to be in the same location because they last for two days and three nights. Staff are looking for a transit-accessible location, probably somewhere in the center of the City, that can hold up to 200 attendees. Other meetings and open houses will be held in different areas of the City. Vice-Chairman Davis expressed interest in attending the meetings of the Community Working Group.

Commissioner Howard commented that the Community Working Group would be sponsored by the Transportation Commission. In response to inquiry by Commissioner Howard regarding the Commission's role in determining the process, Ms. Huish explained that the Commission is the oversight group of the entire master plan process. The Commission will be voting on the plan and forwarding a recommendation to City Council. As the sponsor of the working group, the Commission will help the group understand the feedback loop. The Commission will help staff understand what should be provided to this working group.

Commissioner Howard suggested that it might be a good idea for the Commissioners to see the list of those invited to participate in the Community Working Group.

Ms. O'Connor noted that as Ms. Huish had mentioned earlier, this process is in the early phases. Staff is attempting to get a good cross-section of areas within the City as well as types of groups. Ms. O'Connor suggested that staff could go over the current tentative list of organizations and report back at the next meeting with a more detailed public involvement plan for review. This is an inclusive process and the Commission can add to the list.

Chairman Gilliland noted that the workshops will consist of five sessions over three evenings and two days. Ms. Huish stated the expectation that 50 to 100 people will attend the evening sessions. The day time sessions will be more in open house style, and less people are expected to attend those sessions.

In response to inquiry by Chairman Gilliland regarding the handling of HOAs, Ms. Huish reviewed the tentative list of HOAs and explained that staff intends to contact them and offer to come and speak with them.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked how staff identify transportation modal interest groups, such as cyclists and pedestrians. Ms. O'Connor reported that she has been looking into that issue. There are some informal groups. Staff will continue to search for pedestrian interest groups as Scottsdale prepares its first ever pedestrian plan as a part of the master plan.

Commissioner Taunton suggested contacting the group, which is concerned with non-motorized access to Papago Park (Papago Salado).

Commissioner McCall said she is excited about this process. She thanked Ms. Huish for the work she is doing. Commissioner McCall asked whether City Council members or heads of other departments within the City would be a part of the Community Working Group, suggesting that it might be a good idea to

have advice on any legal questions that arise. She mentioned that the Native American population, being so involved with new commercial development along the Pima Freeway, would be very interested in transportation plans. It might be a good idea for emergency, fire or police professionals to be involved in the Community Working Group. She questioned whether the tourism industry, including the resorts, the downtown area, the Waterfront, and WestWorld, are properly represented.

Ms. Huish reported that staff intends to return every month with updates on the Transportation Master Plan, including opportunities for Commission action at various phases during the process. Mr. Meinhart added that there is also a staff working group with representation from all the different City departments, and specific outreach to neighboring jurisdictions. Staff is actively working with the Salt River Pima Indian Community on issues associated with the Pima Road corridor.

Commissioner Howard wanted to be certain that the plan incorporates future developments. Failure to do so could mean that transportation is a limiting factor. Perhaps Planning should be involved to ensure that transportation is an effective tool for the City in future.

Mr. Meinhart said this is exactly what staff are planning to do. Part of the outreach will be meetings with each of our neighbor communities to talk about the plan and ensure that they understand it. The plan is intended to be forward-looking.

Chairman Gilliland suggested contacting school districts and equestrian groups.

5. **Loop 101 HOV Lane Study**

(Information)

Staff will provide an update on the status of ADOT's Loop 101 HOV Lane Study. This project is funded through Proposition 400—Paul Porell, Traffic Engineering Director

Mr. Porell presented an update on the coordination activities between City staff and the Arizona Department of Transportation regarding the Loop 101 HOV study. The project is the addition of high occupancy vehicle lanes along a 30-mile section of the Pima and Price freeways from Tatum Boulevard south to the end of the 101 at its interchange with the 202 San Tan freeway. Representatives of ADOT were unable to attend tonight's meeting but are planning to present to the Commission on the project at the January meeting. The funds for this project are included in the regional transportation plan. The \$90 million budgeted does not include the construction of noise mitigation, which is currently being studied. No landscaping will be installed, as the existing median will be replaced with a concrete jersey barrier. The first section of the project to be constructed will be the segment from the Pima-Princess interchange on the north to the Loop 202 Red Mountain interchange. That project is currently under design and construction is expected to begin in 2007.

Commissioner Taunton asked why the project ends at Tatum rather than at the interchange with State Route 51. Mr. Porell explained that there is a separate HOV project parallel to this one, which includes analyzing the HOV lanes along

SR 51 from Shea Boulevard north to the interchange with the 101 and extending easterly to Tatum Boulevard.

In response to inquiry by Commissioner Taunton regarding the schedule of the parallel project, Mr. Porell indicated that ADOT staff will be asked to provide that information in their January presentation.

Commissioner Taunton asked about the project's impact on traffic. Mr. Porell said it is anticipated that the impact of the project would be very similar to when HOV lanes were dedicated on SR 51.

In response to a question by Vice-Chairman Davis, Mr. Porell noted that the cost of noise mitigation is included in the budgeted amounts included in Proposition 400.

Commissioner Howard noted that a total of 60 additional lane miles of HOV lanes will be constructed. The average cost is \$1.5 million per lane mile, which he said seems low compared to the 96th Street project, which is \$5.4 million for 2 miles.

Mr. Porell explained that the original design of Loop 101 incorporated accommodations for adding this additional lane. All of the bridges have been constructed at the proper width. The drainage infrastructure is in place to be easily converted. What remains to be done is the construction of the concrete median and the pavement surface. Also, as noted previously, the figure does not include noise mitigation.

Ms. O'Connor reported to the Commission that about a year ago, staff had asked ADOT to consider moving up the design and construction of the general purpose lanes. The cost of construction, the availability of materials, and the cash flow associated with the Proposition 400 program are all factors to be taken into consideration. There is funding for general purpose lanes in Phase 2 and Phase 4 of Proposition 400 in the Scottsdale section of Loop 101. At the next meeting of the Commission, staff will go over the relationship of those projects in the planning process of ADOT and the Maricopa Association of Governments. MAG will be hosting a Construction Roundtable in January, because various transportation and other projects are competing for the same resources. Chairman Gilliland asked whether the City might entertain advancing the design and construction. Ms. O'Connor noted that cash flow and resource availability is a big issue. ADOT would not have the capacity to oversee every highway construction project in Proposition 400 at the same time.

Chairman Gilliland asked if there are some City projects such as transit centers or Park and Ride that go hand-in-hand with the HOV project that the City should be attempting to coordinate.

Mr. Meinhardt answered that staff are looking at siting both a transit center and a Park and Ride in the vicinity of the Mustang Library, since finding land within the City and adjacent to the freeway is a challenge. Staff anticipates that express bus service will use the freeway once the HOV lanes are in place. Implementing the HOV lanes and determining how they affect traffic patterns before advancing the construction of more general purpose lanes is a sensible plan.

In response to inquiry by Chairman Gilliland, Mr. Porell explained that the proposed frontage road projects are basically north and west of the initial construction project. The frontage roads between Scottsdale Road and Pima-Princess would be constructed just after the HOV lane construction. Planning for the frontage roads takes into account the addition of the HOV lanes and eventually more general purpose lanes.

Commissioner McCall noted the study session discussion regarding the lack of direct access to and from the HOV lanes on the freeway. She asked Mr. Porell how the interchanges would be designed if money were not such an obstacle.

Mr. Porell explained that HOV planning is a stepped process. The first step is getting the HOV lanes in place and getting people to use them for longer segments of their trip. The addition of HOV lane interchanges or direct access ramps to enter and exit the freeway would be beneficial, but the first step is to get the body of the HOV system in place. Perhaps a higher priority would be to construct direct HOV interchanges between freeways.

Commissioner McCall asked Mr. Porell how he would envision HOV access around the Airport. Mr. Porell said that direct HOV lane interchanges would be similar to the interchanges that are currently on the regional system. There are direct HOV connections on I-10 at 75th Avenue, Third Avenue and Third Street. These are basically lanes or ramps that enter and exit the freeway from the median side, which connects, to half-mile streets or streets that do not have a general purpose interchange.

Commissioner Bruz asked Mr. Porell about the design of existing interchanges, which would make it hard to add direct HOV access. Mr. Porell replied that staff would not consider adding direct HOV ramp connections to existing arterial interchanges.

Commissioner Howard suggested that at some point it might be a good idea to look at less expensive alternatives such as making the HOV lane limited access, as is done in Southern California. Mr. Porell said that is another good comment, but he believes those types of refinements to HOV lanes come during the maturation of the HOV process, when the lanes are being used solidly.

Chairman Gilliland commented that the largest impact to the residents of Scottsdale will probably be the noise. He asked whether there have been any discussions with ADOT about sound walls.

Mr. Porell said staff has continued to express Scottsdale's concern regarding the noise mitigation issues. The preliminary design concept report for the HOV lanes contains a very cursory analysis of the existing walls at 90th Street. There has been some determination that if the wall heights needed to be increased to mitigate additional noise impacts, that the current walls may not have the structural strength to accommodate additional height. Reinforcing or replacing those walls would be a major construction project. ADOT will present info on the current analysis at the January meeting.

6. **CURRENT TRANSPORTATION PROJECT UPDATES** (Information)

Update on transportation projects, including but not limited to, Loop 101 Photo Enforcement Demonstration Program, Scottsdale Road Streetscape, and Neighborhood Traffic Management process/projects—Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager

Ms. O'Connor noted that the agenda item "General Manager's comments" has been replaced with "Transportation Project Updates."

With regard to the Loop 101 Photo Enforcement project, Ms. O'Connor reported that staff is working closely with ADOT to resolve any questions. The project is still on track and it is expected that warning notices will be issued in January after construction of the equipment, once ADOT has approved the permit. Citations are expected to begin being issued in February.

Concerning the Scottsdale Road project, Ms. O'Connor reported that a community meeting will be held early in 2006 to review design concepts for the section of the Scottsdale Road project from the south City limits to Osborn.

Beginning in January, staff will present the first of a series of discussions regarding proposed elements of the Draft Neighborhood Traffic Management procedures manual.

Commissioner Taunton noted that an editorial in the paper recently was critical of the Indian School Road project, citing that it does not add any roadway capacity. He noticed there was not much support for this article from readers and opined that many residents share his own feeling that making streets more livable can be as important as adding capacity. He suggested that when this project moves forward, it would be important for staff to document the feedback they receive from the public. This could be shown as a proof of success, which could help with other elements in the streets master plan.

Ms. O'Connor added that often the assumption is that adding capacity for other modes does not add capacity to the road network. People also assume that if the roadway is not widened, no vehicular capacity is being added. However, widening intersections increases vehicular capacity. As discussed in previous meetings, in areas where the roadway network is built out, staff will be looking more to intelligent transportation systems, intersection capacity improvements and multi-modal capacity to help solve transportation concerns. In the sections of the City where the roadways are essentially built out, adding more lane miles is something that should be done only very judiciously.

Commissioner Taunton said that the gist of the article was that Scottsdale should be spending its money on projects that increase vehicular capacity. The article said that the Indian School Road project is simply a beautification project that was not really relevant. Other editorials appeared in response to that article stating that the project does increase capacity for other modes, increases capacity at intersections and also noted that this is the gateway to downtown.

Chairman Gilliland asked whether the Indian School Road project is related to the ITS work that had been done. He wondered how much of a hard sell it will be to convince the public that ITS improvements increase vehicular capacity without building more lanes for traffic.

Mr. Porell replied that the ITS improvements along Indian School Road was the first major ITS project in the City. There was a comprehensive analysis of the carrying capacity improvements associated with those ITS improvements. Staff has well documented evidence of the benefits of implementing ITS. There are also safety improvements along Indian School Road that have not been well publicized.

Commissioner Bruz asked if there is a time limit on the permit ADOT will issue the City for photo enforcement, and who will own the equipment once it is installed. Mr. Porell stated that the City is seeking a right-of-way use permit giving the City the right to undertake construction on the Loop 101, which is under ADOT jurisdiction. This is an ongoing activity. The photo enforcement program has been identified as a demonstration project for up to nine months. At the conclusion of the demonstration project, if the equipment were to be removed, another right-of-way use permit would have to be issued. Under contractual agreement, Redflex Traffic Systems owns the equipment and leases it to the City of Scottsdale.

In response to a follow-up question by Commissioner Bruz, Mr. Porell noted that there are several elements in the initial investment in this program. A 45-day public awareness program is currently under way. This is a multi-media campaign with radio announcements on drive time, an open house, and letters/electronic updates informing as many people as possible about the upcoming demonstration project. Warning signs are being installed along the length of the demonstration project. The financial analysis performed to review the demonstration project shows that the upfront costs will be covered approximately by the midpoint of the demonstration project.

Commissioner Bruz commented that if the City decides not to pursue this program past the demonstration project, the initial costs will have been recouped during the course of the demonstration project.

Ms. O'Connor noted that the demonstration program is designed to be revenue-neutral, which means that the costs are offset by the expected revenues for the project. Redflex Traffic Systems charges the City for paid citations only, and to lease the equipment. The City's upfront costs are for the public awareness campaign, placing the warning notices, equipment lease and some of the temporary staff costs.

Chairman Gilliland asked what staff's main concerns were when asking ADOT to go ahead with the demonstration. Mr. Porell identified that ADOT is always concerned about safety. Because this work did involve construction, they were concerned that the City identifies safe locations for the placement of the cameras, which will be behind currently existing barriers.

Chairman Gilliland asked Mr. Porell whether he had concerns about adding these elements to the freeway, and if so, what could be done to mitigate it. He also

wanted to know whether the photo enforcement on Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard was a prototype project.

Mr. Porell said that the City's Focus On Safety program involves the use of photo enforcement for both red light running and speeding. The safety benefits of that program have been recognized through the years.

In response to inquiries by Commissioner Howard regarding evaluation of the project, Mr. Porell explained that a comprehensive evaluation program has been identified. A multi-agency Technical Evaluation Committee includes representatives of ADOT, DPS, the Maricopa and City Court systems and prosecutors' offices, the Federal Highway Administration, Arizona AAA and the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. Compiled baseline data will be compared to the results of the demonstration project. He explained that approximately a year ago, speed information along this section of the Loop 101 was collected. More recently, the Arizona Department of Transportation did additional data collection, both with the demonstration project segment and on a control section of freeway. A third set of data is being collected independently by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety in order to provide an independent analysis of the safety benefits of the project. Historical statistical analysis will be performed from data collected by ADOT's Accident Records Unit.

In response to inquiry by Commissioner Howard, Mr. Porell confirmed that an apples to apples comparison will be achieved. He noted that the only limitation will be to determine if the nine-month period gives sufficient data to have a level of confidence that the impacts seen are from the photo enforcement. Typically, crash analysis is done using a three-year period, but because of the volume of collisions currently on the freeway, the shorter period may suffice.

Commissioner Howard asked why nine months was chosen instead of a year. Ms. O'Connor explained that there are a variety of factors, noting that staff wanted to do the shortest possible demonstration while still addressing all the seasonal factors. This is an extensive program for the City and staff believes this is a reasonable time frame.

Commissioner Bruz asked whether, since this is a City project within ADOT right-of-way, the City had any potential liability exposure. Mr. Porell explained that during the development of the demonstration project, the State Attorney General's office and the City Attorney's office worked out the indemnification language incorporated into the permit; Risk Management also reviewed the language and the insurance coverage provided by Redflex. Ms. O'Connor added that the State's indemnification language is passed through to Redflex Traffic Systems, and the insurance coverage provided by Redflex has increased consistent with that indemnification.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked that this topic be placed on the agenda of a future meeting in order to hear public comment and obtain more detail on the project. Ms. O'Connor agreed and noted that by the February Commission meeting, staff can report on the completed equipment installation and number of warning notices issued, and the first citations should have been issued.

Commissioner Howard suggested that staff might want to keep track of the sale of obfuscating license plate holders. Mr. Porell noted that it has been proven that currently available license plate obfuscation devices are ineffective.

7. **ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR**

Citizens may complete a Citizen Comment card to be submitted to the Transportation Commission before or during this evening's meeting. This time is reserved for citizen comments regarding non-agendized items. No official Transportation Commission action can be taken on these items. Speaker time limit: 3 minutes.

None.

8. **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

None.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

***NOTE: VIDEO AND/OR AUDIO RECORDINGS OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FOR UP TO SIX MONTHS FOLLOWING THE MEETING DATE.**

IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF THE ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, THE SUMMARIZED MINUTES OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE NOT VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTS. ONLY THE ACTIONS TAKEN AND DISCUSSION APPEARING WITH QUOTATION MARKS ARE VERBATIM.

SUBMITTED BY:

A/V Tronics

Officially approved by the Transportation Commission on January 19, 2006